

Messenger of Peace.

"GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST, AND ON EARTH PEACE, GOOD WILL TOWARD MEN."

EDITED BY RICHARD CARRIQUE.—ASHBEL STODDARD, PRINTER.

VOL. I.

HUDSON, SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1824.

No. 7.

ILLUSTRATION OF 2 THES. I. 9.

"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

(Continued from page 43.)

I shall now proceed to notice some passages, which appear to me to decide, what is the meaning of the phrase, "presence of the Lord," in the passage under consideration, and also the nature of the punishment of which it speaks. The first I notice is,

2 Kings xiii. 23, "And the Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion on them, and had respect unto them, because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and would not destroy them, neither cast he them from his presence as yet." But what God here says, that "as yet" he would not do to this people, in the following passage we find it said, he did do to them.

2 Kings, xxiv. 20, "For through the anger of the Lord, it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until he had cast them out from his presence, that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon." The same is repeated, Jer. iii. 5, which I need not transcribe. On these passages I now beg leave to make a few remarks, viewed in connexion with the one we are considering.

1st. In the passages just quoted, it is beyond all fair discussion, that the Jews as a nation are the persons spoken of, and on them the punishment threatened by God, was executed. In the passage we are considering, the Jews are also the persons of whom the apostle speaks, as has been shewn above.

2d. In the above passages, quoted from the Old Testament, *destroying the Jews*, and *casting them out of his presence*, are descriptive of the same punishment. But who ever supposed, that destroying them or casting them out of his presence, meant either their annihilation or their endless misery, in a place called hell? We beg leave to ask, by what authority then do we interpret the same, or similar language used by Paul in the passage before us.

3d. It has been proved satisfactorily we think, that God's presence was in Judea, particularly in the Temple. That was his house and where he delighted to dwell. In the above quoted passages, it is clear as noon day, that to be cast out of God's presence was to be cast out of the land of Judea, from his worship, and to be carried into captivity to Babylon, and dispersed among the heathen. The apostle in the passage before us, evidently had these passages in his eye when he wrote, and borrows

the very language of them to express himself. Indeed well he might, for he was speaking of the same people, and of a similar punishment which was coming on them. The Jews were cast out of God's presence for seventy years, but were brought back to their own land, and again enjoyed his presence. When the apostle wrote to the Thessalonians, the period was drawing near, when they were again to be punished with destruction from the presence of the Lord. They were to be banished from their land, their City and Temple destroyed, and to this day the ruins of Jerusalem, and the dispersed Jews afford ample evidence of its truth. The Jews now are as certainly destroyed, or cast out of God's presence, as their forefathers were, when God cast them out from his presence in their seventy years captivity in Babylon. The language used in speaking of both is the same. How then any candid man can affirm, that the apostle in the passage by destruction from the presence of the Lord meant eternal misery, I am unable to perceive. If the scriptures are allowed to interpret the apostle's meaning, he expresses temporal punishment to the Jews, and in the very language in which their former punishments were expressed by their own prophets.

But the persons are not only said to be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, but it is added,

"And from the glory of his power." Some render this phrase "his glorious power." The question naturally occurs here—The glory of whose power? Should we understand this of the glorious power of the God of Israel, it occasions no difficulty, for his glorious power was certainly displayed to the Jews in their land, and when banished from it, they were punished with destruction from his glorious power, as well as from his presence. But should we understand it of Christ's glorious power, as the context seems to direct, this agrees to what is said concerning Christ at his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem. Referring to this period, Mat. xvi. 27, says, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels." And in reference to the same event adds, "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Chapter xxiv. 30.

2d. Let us now pay some attention to the duration, of this punishment. It is not only said to be destruction, but *everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord*. We presume the word everlasting used here, leads most people to conclude, that the punishment

mentioned is in a future state of existence, and is also of endless duration. A little further attention to the scriptures, we think must convince all, that this very circumstance is a strong confirmation of the interpretation I have given of this passage. Let us then quote

Jer. xxiii. 39, 40, "Therefore, behold, I, even I will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence: And I will bring everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame which shall not be forgotten." See Balfour's Inquiry on this passage, page 182, and compare Deut. xxviii. 37, and xxxi. 17, 18. Hosea ix. 17. Jer. xx. 11, and xxiv. 9, 10, and xlii. 17, 18. On this passage I shall submit for candid consideration a few brief remarks.

1st. No one can doubt, that this passage speaks of the Jews and predicts a punishment which God was to inflict upon them as a nation. That the punishment threatened is of a temporal nature, will not be disputed. That it is described in language similar to the text we are considering, is very obvious. It is described as an everlasting punishment from God's presence. The Jews are to be made an "everlasting reproach," and "perpetual shame." We have sufficiently seen already, that to be cast out of God's presence, is not to be cast into hell, or endless misery, but to be cast out of Judea, and from God's worship and service, and dispersed among the heathen or gentile nations.

2d. What we have got therefore to consider, and account for is,—why the punishment of the Jews of a temporal nature, is called perpetual and everlasting.—This, it is called in the passage we have quoted from the prophet, and it is called everlasting by Paul, in the passage before us. When God said, that he would make the Jews an everlasting reproach, and a perpetual shame, all we think will readily admit, that endless duration is not meant. Why then interpret Paul's language as expressing endless duration of punishment in a future state? He was a Jew, and was speaking of the punishment of the Jews. He was familiar with the language of the Old Testament,—and borrows the phrase "presence of the Lord," and why not also the word everlasting in referring to the very same temporal punishment as is described by Jeremiah. If being cast out of God's presence did not mean under the Old Testament, being cast into a place of future misery, nor the word everlasting added to this punishment, endless duration. Why should such language borrowed from the Old, by the New Testament writers be so interpreted? Did any Jew ever understand the phrase, cast out of God's presence, being cast into hell or endless misery, or, that the word everlasting applied to it, expressed the endless nature of such a punishment!

AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

(Concluded in our next)

FROM THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

THE MORALIST.

"Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel."—Gen. xlix. 4.

This passage of sacred writ is the language of the patriarch Jacob, addressed to his eldest son, Reuben. The occasion of this address is well known to us all. This illustrious personage was then on his death bed, borne down with years and the infirmities of decaying nature. He had called his sons together, around the bed of death, to tell them what should befall them in the latter days. It appears this venerable old man was inspired, so that he could draw aside the veil that hides futurity from the eyes of mortals, and could foresee the future destiny of his descendants. He first begins with his eldest son, Reuben: "Thou art my first born, my might, the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power." All these titles and privileges belonged to Reuben by birth. The most mighty monarch could be possessed of no higher degrees of honor and might;—but alas! by his folly and instability, he forfeited all these inestimable privileges; and all his fond anticipations of future glory and happiness proved like an idle dream. Reader, have you not been acquainted with those, who like Reuben, by their instability, have forfeited all the advantages, which they might have enjoyed from their birth? Education and standing in society,—all these privileges, great as they were, have been thrown away by the unstable, who, like water can never excel. Such a person as this, may have great natural abilities; he may be possessed of many amiable and endearing virtues; he may be polished in manners; his address may be pleasing; his conversation may be fascinating and delightful. He may make great professions of regard for those with whom he associates; but what confidence can we put in the man, who, unstable in his ways, may be turned against us by the artful devices of the slanderer, and of him who goes up and down as a talebearer, amongst his neighbors? Such a detestable character as this would soon make the unstable and credulous man believe that you were his enemy, and that you had spoken thus and so against him, when, at the same time, it was a base invention of his own, to prejudice the unstable man against you. Had the person, to whom these tales were told, been possessed of true wisdom and good judgment, he would have examined into the truth of what he had heard, and have been convinced at once of the folly of hearkening to a tattler and liar; for these two characters, are inseparably connected.—But the unstable man never allows himself time to reflect; if a well told tale, salutes his ears, he, at once, receives it for truth. The person who relates it, he embraces as a friend, when he is but an enemy in disguise. Thus does the unstable person, forfeit his true friends. They become strangers to him, because they can place

no dependance in his friendship. For a moment, take a view of the solitary man, who stands, as it were, alone in the midst of the earth with none to comfort him. He has no endearing wife and lovely children to greet him with smiles of affection and love. To use the sublime language of a modern writer, his age must know no kindly hearth; none will be left to bear up his name; he must go down to the grave without a friend to drop a tear over his cold remains.—What has occasioned this? In youth he had a fair prospect of enjoying the sweets of love and friendship. Every thing conspired to make him happy; but alas, he was of that number, who, unstable as water, cannot excel. In youth no one could long engage his friendship or love. He was by turns, a friend to all his acquaintance, and a lover to all the fair part of creation; but through instability, he forsook them all, and in turn he finds himself solitary and forsaken. He distrusted all; and no one will place confidence in him. These are some of the fruits, the unstable man has to reap. But these are not all: when he takes a retrospect view of his past life, he despises himself, if I may be permitted to use the expression. When he reflects on his conduct, and sees, he has, by his folly, lost so many rich blessings that he might have enjoyed, he cannot but view himself with disgust.

My brethren, are we amongst the number of those who are unstable in their ways; who, without reflection, embrace every opinion however absurd? If this be the case with any of us, may we, without delay, commence the work of self-examination. May we not put it off another day. If we are possessed of a fickle, unstable mind, we can never enjoy true happiness. I am not arguing that a person should never change his sentiments, on any subject; it is the duty of every person, when he is convinced that he has embraced an erroneous sentiment, to abandon it. But we should, with care and attention, examine a thing well, before we receive it as truth. MORALIST.

West Cambridge, May 8, 1824.

FOR THE MESSENGER OF PEACE.
LOVE OF GOD.

1 JOHN IV. 9, 10.

"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."

John who is justly styled the beloved apostle, dwells much upon the love of God to sinners, and seems to consider it as essentially necessary that we should know this important truth. He considers the knowledge of this fact to be the foundation of the Christian virtues, and that ignorant of it, we run into all manner of iniquity. In conformity to this opinion he says, "we love him (God) because he first lov-

ed us." It will be readily admitted by all classes of professing christians, that destitute of love to God, man is a sinner. If then we love God because he first loved us, that love being anterior to our love, God loved us while we were sinners. He loved us, when we did not love him, and manifested or made known to us his love by sending his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. If these declarations be true, that we love him because he first loved us, it will be easily seen that this love should be exhibited to the mind of the sinner, and every exertion made to convince him that God loves him, and thus enkindle in his heart that holy spirit of grateful affection, that shall cause him to love his God.

Paul hath said, that faith working by love purifies the heart. Love then passes the purifying power, it cleanses the heart, and sanctifies and sets it apart unto every good work. How sadly has the sentiments and opinions of the apostles, been misunderstood by those whose duty it is as faithful stewards of the grace of God, to lead men to the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord. Instead of laboring with sinners to show them, that God there heavenly father loves them, and has, in the fulness of this love, sent his Son to be the propitiation for their sins, they are declaring directly the contrary, and telling sinners of the wrath and anger of Almighty God, whose wrath and anger will continue to burn towards them, until they shall return to God, and love him. The apostles, or our modern divines have sadly mistaken this point. If, as it is frequently stated at the present day, to preach the love of God to sinners is a demoralizing doctrine, and nought but the fear of hell can deter sinners from pursuing their wicked courses; then did both John and Paul misunderstand the true doctrine of grace, and the means necessary to be employed to produce the reformation of the sinner, and turn him from his evil ways. The one apostle saith, The goodness of God leads to repentance, the other declares the love of God is the cause of our loving him; but modern teachers say the love of God preached to sinners, hardens them in sin, and opens the way to all licentiousness.

The love of God to sinners is considered by John, as a reason why we ought to love one another. "Beloved," says he, "if God so loved us, we ought also, to love one another." What a blessing it would be to us in this world of

infirmities, transgression and error, if we possessed that love recommended by the apostle. How much strife, slander, ill will and animosity would be avoided. Whatever might be the feelings we should see in others, if we had a knowledge of the love of God, in pardoning our sins, we should pardon and forgive, even as God for Christ's sake has forgiven us.

Scholastic ingenuity in support of a favorite system, has introduced an opinion directly contrary to the true meaning of the apostle, and much labor is expended in showing that by the word, "beloved," is meant believers only, and that the expression, "we ought so to love one another" signifies that believers ought to love one another. The fallacy and absurdity of this, will be clearly seen by entering into the inquiry, how did God love us? Answer, when we did not love him, when we were aliens and strangers to the covenant of promise. Having thus fairly stated the case, we now proceed to ascertain if possible what constitutes man a "beloved" object. When the apostle used the expression "Beloved" he meant those who were beloved of God. If he did not mean this, we know not what he did mean. If they were not beloved of God by whom were they *beloved*.

If by the phrase "beloved" was meant those who were beloved of God, we next must ascertain who are those thus beloved. This is clearly shown by the expression "Herein is love not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." John has thrown more light on this subject, in the following declaration "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, who is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." If then, God's sending his son to be the propitiation for our sins, is an evidence, or manifestation of the divine love, then as Jesus is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, or all mankind, all men are beloved. This is proved by other declarations. "God so loved the world, that he sent his son not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." The world then, or all men, are the beloved of God, who are exhorted to love one another.

The absurdity of the statement that believers are the only persons that are exhorted to love one another, will be clearly seen, by attending to the following particulars. Would a man be

considered as a believer in Christ who did not love the brethren, or members of his church and religious sect? Is it not an evidence of discipleship, that those who make the profession of religion *love* those of like precious faith? Would a person be received into a church as a follower, and servant of Christ, who did not love those of the same profession? If not, why the exhortation "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." The passage, evidently presupposes that they, whom God loved so exceedingly, did not love each other as they ought, and were, therefore, proper subjects for exhortation. But herein is the greatness of the love of God? In loving us when we did not love him. And we are exhorted to love one another, because God loved us thus exceedingly. But can we be said, to imitate God, and to love each other as he loved us by limiting our affections, to those who love us, or are friendly to us? surely not. God loved those, who loved him not, but were enemies to him, alienated through the ignorance that was in them, and he requires us to do the same. That it never was intended that the christian's love and friendship should be confined to those who believed with them, or had received the enlightening influence of the grace of God, is clearly proved by the following passages of Scripture. Jesus says, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." He had just before given his disciples a *New Commandment* "A new commandment give I unto you that ye love one another as I have loved you." Again, "I say unto you which hear, love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. For if ye love them, which love you, what thank have ye? For sinners also love those that love them, and if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners will also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again: and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the highest; for he is kind unto the unthankful and the evil."

These and numerous passages in the sacred volume, show us that our love is not to be con-

finer by any sectarian lines or boundaries but that we are to love all men, even as God has loved us. Our heavenly Father is held up as an example, and he is declared to be good unto all, and that his tender mercies are over all his works. He is good unto the unthankful and the evil.

Could or would men lay aside their prejudices; those prejudices which confine their affection and friendship within very contracted circles, and would they listen to the instructions of wisdom, and be guided by the word of eternal truth, then would they enjoy the sweets of religion, and gratitude to the supreme Being would cause them to love one another and to live in bonds of perfectness and Peace.

MESSENGER OF PEACE.

HUDSON, SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1824.

EVANGELIST.

"THE PERFECT RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD THE REASON OF HIS INFLECTING ETERNAL PUNISHMENT ON HIS FOES."

(Concluded from page 46.)

The writer having brought forward all that he thought worthy of notice from the scriptures in proof of his first proposition (says,) "That God will punish his incorrigible enemies for ever and ever," proceeds to shew in his second proposition, "that he, (God) will do this, because of the *perfect rectitude* of his government"—or as he afterwards expresses himself, "because of the *perfect rectitude of his (God's) character*." The method adopted to show the *rectitude* of the *character* or government of God, is one, I believe, original with the writer in the Evangelist, and which he ought to have the exclusive right of using.—The reason is this, if reasoning it may be called—

"Men sometimes punish those who are subject to their authority in a fit of passion, their tempers are excited, and they deal out the strokes of their vengeance in a rage"—"But God is not susceptible of passion in this sense of it."

"Men sometimes punish their enemies, in order to be *revenged on them*. They have received some injury or insult; and they mean to retaliate—they mean to seek revenge. It might be shown that a God of perfect holiness never indulges a selfish, vengeful spirit such as this, and consequently, that such a spirit never excites him to punish his enemies."

"Men, in some instances, inflict punish-

ment on their enemies from settled *malice*. They hate them—they wish them ill—they wish to see them, and are resolved to make them as unhappy as possible. It might be shown conclusively that God indulges no such malice towards his enemies, nor does the punishment he inflicts on them result from any such feelings."

"Were the Supreme Being, vengeful, or malicious—were he altogether such an one as ourselves, his enemies might have vastly less to fear from him, than they have at present."

Reader, pause one moment, on the arguments of this writer. If God were a passionate and vengeful Being like man, there would be some reason to HOPE that the enemies of God would not be punished eternally. They would have vastly less to fear from God, than they now have, in consequence of the perfect rectitude of his character. Alas! alas! kind reader, the perfect rectitude, and righteousness of your God precludes all hopes of salvation. Were God a passionate Being and punished his enemies in a passion, there would be no reason to suppose that their punishment would be endless—and why not? Because says our author, "the paroxysm of rage must subside and the punishment growing out of it must cease."

"God does not punish from a selfish, vengeful spirit. If he did, it is not likely it would excite him to punish forever. If it was a mere selfish revenge which urged him on, this revenge would in time be glutted. He (God,) would come at length to feel that he had retaliated sufficiently, and would be led to say, *it is enough*."

Again, God does not inflict in *malice*—"Mere malice must at length be satiated. Mere malice, which is a wicked feeling of the heart, and cannot have any constant, abiding principle to support it, must in time be exhausted."

Reader, what a pity it is that your God possessed not these passions, if he did there would be some HOPE for poor sinful worms of the dust. If he were worked up into a rage it would in time subside. If exercised by revenge, he would become satiated and say, *it is enough*. If by *malice*, it would become exhausted and the victim would escape its fury. But as God possesses none of these feelings, and neither punishes in a *passion*, out of *revenge*, or in *malice*, there is no reason to expect that punishment ever will end. God can never be satisfied, never say, *it is enough*.—

Such is the perfect righteousness of God and the perfections of his character and government that endless punishment is inevitably the lot of his enemies.

May we not here be permitted to inquire if God do not punish in a passion, out of revenge, or malice for what—or for what purpose does he punish? It is evident that if this punishment is to be endless it cannot be designed to restrain the offender; and we trust that it will never be said, that saints, in the divine kingdom of blessedness and glory, will need the example to deter them from the commission of crime. If not, for what does God punish?—The writer in the Evangelist attempts to answer this question, yet he falls vastly short of giving us anything like a reason why God should thus punish. He says, “the single reason which impels the Deity forward in the punishment of his incorrigible foes, is the *rectitude of his character*.” What does this writer mean, “*by rectitude of character*!” If God possesses none of those hateful *passions*, rage, *revenge*, or *malice*—What are the properties which form the divine character? That God does not possess, either rage, or a vindictive spirit of revenge or malice we fully agree, no such base passions, disgrace or blacken the divine character; but it seems, according to the writer in the Evangelist, that it is unfortunate for man, that he does not, for if he did, there would be some hope of the salvation of the sinner, but now there is none.

The perfections of divine nature and character demand attention.—John declares that God is *Love*. By this heavenly and divine attribute or property, is the Almighty governed in all his dealings with the creatures of his power. Men have for the sake of expressing their views, on the various dispensations of the divine government, considered God as possessing various attributes, and have enumerated SEVEN divine properties in the nature, or forming the character of God. These SEVEN which are Wisdom, Knowledge, Power, Justice, Mercy, Love, and Truth must perfectly harmonize and agree, in order to produce perfection of righteousness in the divine character. Should justice and mercy require two different things as is often represented. viz. Justice demanding the endless damnation of the sinner while mercy on the other hand anxiously pleads for his pardon and salvation; then in that case, there would be a want of harmony

in the properties or attributes of God, and consequently, a want of perfection in the divine character. God while under the influence of mercy, would in the benevolence of his spirit feel disposed to spare and save, while stern inflexible and inexorable justice would demand the damnation of the objects of its vengeance, and the Almighty compelled to yield, contrary to the dictates of wisdom and of love. Is there not then a want of perfection in the divine character? Most certainly.

Our author informs us that, “When they, (men) have transgressed his (God’s) laws and rejected his son, and persisted in rejecting him until their probation has expired, it would be wronging himself, and wronging the universe should he spare them more; and it is because he cannot be guilty of all this wrong that he does not spare them.” That God will punish his disobedient children, no person acquainted with the scriptures can doubt for a moment.—But that he will punish them without end, is yet to be proved. This proof has been attempted by the writer in the Evangelist, but without success, as must be apparent to every candid reflecting mind, and we might with propriety have taken our leave of him, on showing that he had failed in the support of his first proposition. The absurdity of his reasons why God will punish without ever being satiated or satisfied was so glaring that we consider it our duty to notice them. It is, says he, because God cannot be guilty of all *this wrong*, that he does not spare them that are his foes. Kind reader, in what will all *this wrong* consist, if God should in his infinite wisdom cause his punishments to work for the good of the afflicted and he should give unto them eternal life.—This we believe it will be very difficult for you to satisfactorily determine. The writer says, God would wrong himself if he spared the sinner more, and imperious duty compels the Deity to punish the creature without mercy and without end. In what manner can the Almighty be wronged if he in his unbounded goodness should cause the chastisement which he righteously inflicts upon the disobedient, to accomplish the end and design of all punishment, that is, the reformation of the offender. It is necessary that we should bear in mind what has already been stated. That punishment is designed to effect one of two things. First, the reformation of the offender, or secondly, to deter others from the commission of

crime. It has ever been considered that, that punishment which neither reforms the sufferer, nor operates as a preventative to crime in others, is useless, is effective of no good whatever, and ought to be abolished. That wisdom which God has imparted to man thus teaches, that all punishment ought to be measured to the crime and ought ever to be inflicted, for those salutary purposes. According to the writer in the EVANGELIST, God must have affixed a penalty, or punishment to the transgression of his law, without any regard as to the ultimate end to be produced by the punishment, or he must be destitute of that wisdom and divine energy which are necessary to produce the intended effect. If the Almighty has determined to punish without end, and without any design to reform the offender, or that the punishment should operate as a necessary example to deter others from the commission of crime, for what does he punish. The writer says, God does not punish in a passion, nor for revenge, nor in malice. If then the Almighty does punish without mitigation, or end, for what intent or purpose is this punishment inflicted? It is not to reclaim the sufferer, no, his punishment is to continue through endless duration. It is not as an example to deter others from the commission of crime for this punishment is not inflicted until those, who are eye witnesses and spectators of the wretchedness and misery of the sufferers, are placed in a situation where they do not need the example. No man, who will exercise his reason, can believe that the saints or glorified beings in Heaven will need the fiery furnace continually in their sight to keep them in Heaven, or that, were it not for the miseries of the damned which they continually witness, they would rush from the blest abodes, and leave their God and Redeemer to inhabit the eternal kingdom alone.

There is but one reason that can be given why God should endlessly punish his offending children—that is, he formed a law and affixed a penalty to it which requires that he should inflict endless punishment upon the sinner, and having thus done, he is bound by the law to inflict the penalty, whether it is effective of any good, or not, and *imperious duty* compels him, however contrary it may be to the feelings of divine benevolence, thus to punish. But can it be believed, even for one moment, that the Almighty has, by want of due consideration, and the exercise of wisdom, placed himself in this unhappy predicament, that he must punish whether good is produced or not. We cannot believe it. The law is holy, just and good, founded in infinite wisdom, justice, and mercy. It is a law of love and requires no punishment that is not necessary for the production of the best possible good. And it yet remains to be shown that the infliction of endless punishment can in any way tend to the glory of God, display the perfect righteousness of his character, be productive of good to the punished, or to any creature or being in the uni-

verse. Until this is done, and it is clearly shown that the perfect righteousness of God requires him to punish without mercy and without end for the accomplishment of no good whatever, we cannot believe this heart withering and God dishonoring doctrine.

Notwithstanding the writer declares that God does not punish in a passion, or out of revenge. Yet he forgets himself, and gives us the following sentiment. "Supported and guided by such principles, the great Eternal will not be swayed by mere feeling, (that is, if we understand him, feelings of mercy, compassion or kindness) as sinful creatures, either to the right hand or to the left. But having arisen up in "true and righteous judgment," to punish his incorrigible foes, he will go on with them, in the same way, to all eternity. He will ROLL his VENGEANCE after them, in one *unfailing, unbroken stream* for ever and ever." Turning to Johnson's dictionary we find that to do with vengeance is, *to do it with vehemence*—And that the word vengeful is derived from vengeance and signifies *Vindictive* revengeful. If then God will "ROLL HIS VENGEANCE" on his foes, it looks a little like passion or revenge whatever our friend may say to the contrary.

INSTALLATION.

On Thursday the 13th instant, Br. SEBASTIAN STREETER was installed Pastor over the first Universalist Church and Society in this city. *Introductory Prayer*, by Br. Barzillai Streeter of Salem; *Sermon*, from 2 Cor. iii. 6, by Br. Russell Streeter of Portland, Me.; *Installing Prayer*, by Br. Hosea Ballou, 2d. of Roxbury; *Delivery of the Scriptures, and Charge*, by Br. Thomas Jones of Gloucester; *Right Hand of Fellowship*, by Hosea Ballou of Boston; *Concluding Prayer*, by Br. Edward Turner of Portsmouth; *Benediction*, by Br. Sebastian Streeter.

These services were accompanied with the highly interesting performances of the Choir of the Society.

May the Blessing of the Divine Presence rest on this ancient and numerous Society, and their beloved and respected Pastor.

Universalist Magazine.

St. Paul's Cathedral, London.—This Structure was 35 years in building, and cost 736,722*l* sterling, [3,263,208 dollars.] It is 500 feet long, and 250 feet wide, the summit of the dome is 340.

St. Peter's Cathedral, Rome, was 105 years building; it is 729 feet long, 364 wide and 457 feet high to the summit of the cross.

Bridgeport Farmer.

"Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me: and to him that ordereth his conversation aright, will I shew the salvation of God." PSALMS.

POETRY.

FROM THE WASHINGTON REPUBLICAN.

They shall perish, but thou remainest.—Heb.

SUNS and planets—every orb,

Spark of thee, who shin'st forever,

Time shall quench, and age absorb—

These shall fade; but thou shalt—never!

Wealth and beauty, pride and power—

Ties which only death could sever—

Every fruit of earth, and flower—

These shall fade; but thou shalt—never!

Emerald isles, on ocean sleeping—

Skies that seem to spread forever—

Links of life through nature creeping—

These shall fade; but thou shalt—never!

Every grace of human art,

Time's unsparing hand shall sever—

Dreams of fancy—spells of art—

These shall fade; but thou shalt—never!

All the range of nature's reign—

Sunny landscapes, smiling ever—

Silver moon and starry train—

These shall fade; but thou shalt—never!

All shall fade, from earth and sea;

Oceans dry, and mountains sever;

Time and tide shall cease to be—

Thou alone remain'st forever.

ORLANDO.

Died,

At Curacao, on the 5th of May last, Mr. EDWARD G. GARDNER, aged 24, the son of Gayer Gardner, Esq. of this City. Although short the opportunity we had of forming an acquaintance with the deceased, it was sufficient to unfold the amiable qualities of his mind, and to persuade us that to him nature was prolific in her gifts. The mildness of his disposition, and the suavity of his manners, laid hold, with irresistible power, on the affections of all his acquaintances, and gained for him their esteem and friendship. Persuaded that his youthful companions, and indeed all who have associated with him in life, and who duly appreciate his worth, and deeply sympathize with his afflicted relatives, will receive consolation in learning the attentions he received though in a land of strangers, we publish the following obituary notice which appeared in the Curacao Courant of May 8th.

OBITUARY.

We regret, having to announce the sudden dissolution of a most amiable young man Mr. EDWARD G. GARDNER son of Gayer Gardner, Esq. of the city of Hudson in the state of New-York. About seven or eight months since, Mr. G. had come to Curacao, the second time, for the improvement of his health, and had partially effected it. But intending to return home, had taken passage in the brig Morning Star, Capt. Waring, for New-York. Every thing was on board, the vessel cleared out, and on the eve of sailing, Mr. G. went on shore for the purpose of seeing a friend to whom he was particularly attached, but nearly at the same moment of bidding adieu, he was seized with a fever, which terminated his existence on the evening of the fourth day of his illness.

Every thing that medical skill, friends, and unremitting attention could do for his recovery, was done, but every effort was unavailing. He died at eight o'clock on the 4th instant in the 24th year of his age. Samuel Lyon, Esq. to whom he was intimately known, and who from his feeling and manner must have loved him like a Brother, had his remains deposited in the Family Vault of R. Lyle, Esq. deceased. His funeral was attended by all who knew him either personally or by character. Mr. Lyon attended as chief mourner, but, all mourned—

all regretted his sudden and unexpected dissolution, and

the early and fatal disappointment of his hopes. His country, his father and friends have lost one whose talents were of the finest order, of inflexible integrity, and of character moral, amiable and without a stain.

The following lines were handed us by one, who was with him when dying and with whom he was intimately acquainted.

Look on this mirror, boast not of to-morrow,
But, if thou must, shun then, the "house of sorrow"
Approach it not, far, from such place remove
Enjoy elsewhere, all, that thy heart approve,
Let hope converging brighten to thy view
And give thy prospects, all the rainbow's hue
Be happy in thyself, make others so:
Wall thee with pleasures—still one cup of woe
Thou, too must drink! for covert fate destroys
Sooner or later, all earth's sweetest joys.

A youth, whom virtue, and that friendship moved,
Such, Edward was, by all, who knew him loved,
With innate fancy, vivid at his touch,
Yet, what things were, he painted them "just such"
And spoke of mankind, only to disclose,
What sound reflection, or experience knows,
From him, blithe folly, seldom wiled an hour,
For nothing else, but truth, with him had pow'r,
On Hudson's banks, plain truth her banner waves,
She took him early, and he learned her ways,
Some six months absent, from his, native air
Affection called him, he was hastening there.

Not five days since, "hope told a flattering tale"
And pass'd before him, with a joyful gale,
His father's home, seem'd nearing to his view,
Time crept along, but, love and feeling flew,
The topsail loose, the pilot at the helm,
And not one tear, regret to overwhelm,
Stop—there is one, ingratitude's a stain,
Which, must not be impress'd, on Edward's name
"A friend expects—on shore, ah, let me go"
"Five minutes stay, then farewell, Curacao."

The vessel waits, her sails beshrew the mast,
But W———g* loves him, thus the day is past,
The morning comes, but comes with feverish glare,
The vessel sails, but Edward is not there.

What means that sound, why this discordant thrill,
Which chills my blood, and says to hope, "be still"
Relentless fate, her victim unaware,
Coiling around, is deaf to tears and prayers,
An anxious sigh, a never dividing groan,
Calls out for help, but where—on earth, there's none
The fires of death, consume the sacrifice,
On cloudless incense, vital sparks arise,
Exhausted now, pains, doubts and terrors cease,
Heaven wills it so,—Jehovah gives him peace.

Curacao, 5th May, 1824.

* Capt. S. T. Waring, of the brig Morning Star, with whom Mr. Gardner had come out to Curacao.

In this city on the 23th ult. FREDERICK WILLIAM infant son of Capt. Daniel Coffin, aged 3 year and 6 months.

"So fades the lovely blooming flower,
"Sweet smiling solace of an hour;
"So soon our transient comforts fly
"And pleasure only blooms to die."

RURAL REPOSITORY.

The First Number of this Paper was published last Saturday, those who wish to subscribe for it, will please to send their names to W. B. STODDARD, at A. STODDARD'S Book-Store, as the second number will not be published until more Subscribers are obtained.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, AT \$1 PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE, AT THE OFFICE OF THE
MESSENGER OF PEACE, NO. 135, CORNER
OF WARREN AND THIRD-STREETS.